

### **REMARKS**

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 21, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1 and 13 are hereby amended and claim 17 is hereby canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-16 and 18-20 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Yoshihara et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,115,016); rejected claims 13-16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihara et al. in view of Takabayashi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,573,882); and objected to claims 17 and 19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The rejections of the claims are respectfully traversed and reconsideration of the claims is requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 17 and 19, however, the rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Yoshihara et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is patentable over Yoshihara et al. in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example "a signal processing circuit connected to...[a] data input driver and the light sources, wherein the signal processing circuit directly controls a luminance of each of the light sources." Yoshihara et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-12, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over Yoshihara et al.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner reiterates the previously asserted teachings of Yoshihara et al. and additionally states that Yoshihara et al. teaches "the use of signal processing circuit (31)... electrically controlling a luminance of each of the light sources R, G, and B of the back light 22 by utilizing the synchronous signal SYN for turning ON and OFF each of the light

source individually.” It is respectfully submitted that Yoshihara et al. teaches at column 8, lines 41-45, “[t]he back light control circuit/driving power source 35 gives the driving voltage to the back light 22 in synchronization with the synchronous signal SYN which is given by the control signal generating circuit/image memory 31 so as to make the LED array 7 of the back light 22 emit light.” Further, at column 9, lines 7-11, Yoshihara et al. states “[a]s a result of the above-mentioned emission control of the back light 22 by the back light control circuit/driving power source 35... the above-mentioned displaying control method of a liquid crystal displaying apparatus... can be realized.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Yoshihara et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least the aforementioned element recited in claim 1.

The rejection of claims 13-16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihara et al. in view of Takabayashi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 13 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including, for example “driving the Red, Green, and Blue light sources in sequential sub-frames so as to produce respective luminances Ra, Ga and Ba, wherein Ra, Ga and Ba are in accord with the following:  $R_x \times (T_r \times T_k) = R_a$ ;  $G_y \times (T_g \times T_k) = G_a$ ; and  $B_z \times (T_b \times T_k) = B_a$  where  $T_r$ ,  $T_g$ , and  $T_b$  are transmissivities of the liquid crystal,  $R_x$ ,  $G_y$ , and  $B_z$  are luminances of the light sources, and  $T_k$  is a transmissivity of the liquid crystal panel.” None of the cited references, including Yoshihara et al. or Takabayashi singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13-16, 18, and 20, which depend from claim 13, are also allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 09/988,650  
Amdt. dated September 21, 2004  
Reply to Final Office Action dated June 21, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.536.00-US

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: September 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

for By Valerie P. Hayes <sup>Reg. No.</sup> 53,005  
Kurt M. Eaton  
Registration No.: 51,640  
McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant